GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

# Chandigarh Administration Gazette

**Published by Authority**

No. 094] CHANDIGARH, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2026 (BHADRA 04, 1948 SAKA)

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 24th August, 2026

**No. 691556-HII(2)-2026/8566** In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment"s Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **35/2024 dated 03.08.2026** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between:

ARVIND PASWAN S/O SH. JAYNARYAN PASWAN R/O VILLAGE KANSA DEVI, TEHSIL KHARAR, DISTRICT SAS NAGAR MOHALI (PUNJAB). (WORKMAN)

AND

1. THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR, FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2nd FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH.
2. THE FORESTER (KANSAL & KAMBAWALA BEAT), FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2ND FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH.
3. THE FOREST GUARD (KANSAL & KAMBAWALA BEAT), FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2ND FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH.
4. SH. JUGAL KISHOR & SONS, OFFICE AT VILLAGE MADHEVPUR, POST OFFICE SAKETARI, DISTRICT PANCHKULA, HARYANA.
5. BAGGA CONTRACTOR, C/O FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2ND FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH. (MANAGEMENT)

**AWARD**

1. Workman Arvind Paswan has presented Industrial Dispute in hand under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *(here-in-after in short called „ID Act").*

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by SURESH BALA
Date: 2026.08.26 16:09:38 IST
Reason: Published
Location:

2. Case of the workman is that the workman was appointed by management No.2 & 3 on behalf of Forest Department w.e.f. 02.04.2017 as Mali. His last drawn wages were ` 11,900/- per month. He had continuously worked with the management up to 09.05.2023. The services of the workman were shown under management No.4 & 5 after the year 2018 but management No.1 to 3 have full supervision & control


*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

on his service. On 10.05.2023, the services of the workman were terminated without giving any prior notice. The management had not issued any memo, charge sheet nor conducted any inquiry in any matter before termination of his services. The management had neither paid or offered notice pay in lieu of notice nor paid retrenchment compensation to the workman. Job of the workman still exists with the management. Juniors to the workman were retained in service and fresh workers were appointed in place of the workman. The management has violated the provisions of Section 25F, 25G & 25H of the ID Act. Prayer was made for reinstatement of the workman with continuity of service with full back wages and all other applicable consequential benefits.

3. Management No.1 to 3 contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection that there was no privity of contract between the workman and the answering management, as such, no employer-employee relationship ever existed between them. On merits, it is specifically denied that the workman was appointed by the answering management w.e.f. 02.04.2017 as Mali. Since the workman was never employed by the answering management so the question of termination of his services does not arise. A prayer was made for dismissal of the claim of the workman.

4. Management No.4 & 5 did not file separate written statement. Learned Representative for management No.1 to 5 made the statement that he did not intend to file separate written statement on behalf of management No. 4 & 5 and written statement filed by management No.1 to 3 jointly be considered on behalf of management No. 4 & 5.

5. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 21.10.2024 :-

1. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is illegal, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW

2. Whether the claimant-workman does not fall within the definition of 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act ?OPM

3. Whether the claim statement is not maintainable in the present form ? OPM

4. Relief.

6. Thereafter, both the parties were called upon to lead their respective evidence.

7. During the pendency of the present industrial dispute, Learned Representative for the workman made the statement, which reads as under :-

> *"Stated that due to technical defect, I do not press the present Industrial Dispute Reference, with liberty to file the same afresh. The present Industrial Disputes Reference may be decided accordingly."*

8. In view of the aforesaid statement of Learned Representative for the workman, the industrial dispute in hand stands disposed off being not pressed with liberty to file the same afresh. Appropriate Government be informed accordingly. File be consigned to records after due compliance.

.

(Sd/-) . . .,

Dated : August 03, 2026.

(MANISHA JAIN)
UIDNo. PB0158
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 24th August, 2026

**No. 691466-HII(2)-2026/8568**.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **18/2024 dated 09.07.2026** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between:

VINAY KUMAR, H.NO.669-J, RANJIT NAGAR, KHARAR, DISTRICT MOHALI (WORKMAN)

AND

M/S DESH SEWAK DAILY, SECTOR 29-D, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS GENERAL MANAGER. (MANAGEMENT)

**AWARD**

1. Workman Vinay Kumar has presented Industrial Dispute in hand under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *(here-in-after in short called 'ID Act').*

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that on 01.08.2017, the workman was appointed by the respondent-management as Sub-Editor. He remained in uninterrupted employment up to 30.05.2020 when his services were illegally & wrongly terminated by the respondent-management. He was drawing Rs.10,000/- per month as wages. On 01.06.2020, the workman went to attend his normal duty but he was refused work by the management on the pretext that he should withdraw himself from the list of workers, who authorised the Union to serve upon the management a demand notice dated 05.01.2020. When the workman refused to sign the paper then management refused work to him without assigning any reason and notice. Refusal of work which amount to termination is retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the ID Act. The management has violated Section 25F of the ID Act. No charge sheet was issued, no inquiry was held and the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation at the time of termination. For his reinstatement the workman served a demand notice dated 12.11.2020 upon the respondent-management. The respondent-management neither denied the contents of the demand notice nor took the workman back on duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh was requested for his intervention but the dispute could not be settled within the stipulated time. Termination is illegal, wrong, motivated, against the principle of natural justice and unfair labour practice. A prayer was made for reinstatement of the workman with continuity of service, full back wages and without any change in his service condition as he remained unemployed from the date of termination till date.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection inter alia on the ground that the claim statement is nothing but an abuse of process of law. It is submitted that on 24.01.2020, the workman left his work to indulge himself in the unlawful strike, devoid of any discernible agenda, incited by an individual Ashok Kumar – Co-worker. The said action was very aggressive and with a sole intention to deliberately inflict harm upon the organisation and to pressurize the respondent-management to withdraw the inquiry / disciplinary proceedings to be conducted on serious allegations against Ashok Kumar and Surjit Singh. Despite numerous written and verbal requests extended to workman, urging his prompt return to work, they persisted in their refusal to do so. The workman along with other workers, obstructed the main gate creating a situation of intimidation where anyone attempting to enter would be met with repercussions. In order to address that issue promptly,

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

the matter was formally reported to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh vide letter dated 25.01.2020 with a copy of the same to the S.H.O., Industrial Area, Phase – I, Chandigarh. The said incident was also formally reported to the Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh, who further marked it to Assistant Labour Commissioner, seeking immediate intervention. The said communication was documented vide Diary No.PA/DC 27.01.2020. It is submitted that a show-cause notice was issued to the workman on 11.02.2020 through registered post to show cause within one week of receipt of letter as to why his services should not be terminated for having indulged in misconduct, breach of contract of employment, breach of discipline and for causing incalculable losses. The workman chosen not to file reply and voluntarily abandoned the service by remaining absent without any intimation, explanation or authorization. It is submitted that the workman continuously remained absent without authorization and a show-cause notice was again issued on 19.02.2020 through registered post granting him another opportunity to submit his explanation and to come present in the office of AGM, Desh Sewak on 24.02.2020 but the workman did not pay any heed and continued to abscond and abandoning his duty. The respondent-management kept waiting for the workman to show-up for considerable long period of time for any responsible and interested employee to join back but the workman never came back and filed the present claim statement. Prayer was made for dismissal of the claim of the workman.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 09.02.2026 :-

1. Whether the termination of services of the workman is illegal ? If so, to what effect and what relief he is entitled to ?OPW

2. Whether the claim statement is not maintainable ?OPM

3. Relief.

5. Thereafter, both the parties were called upon to lead their respective evidence.

6. Despite availing opportunities, the workman did not lead any evidence. Today i.e. on 09.07.2026 neither the workman nor anyone on his behalf has appeared before the Court.

7. I have gone through the case file. In the case in hand, as per claim of the workman, he was aggrieved that his services were terminated illegally by the management. However, as per record, the workman has failed to lead any evidence and none has appeared on behalf of the workman before the Court to pursue his case. It seems that the workman is not interested in perusing the matter. Accordingly, the industrial dispute in hand stands declined for want of prosecution.Appropriate Government be informed accordingly. File be consigned to records after due compliance.

(Sd/-) . . .,

Dated : July 09, 2026.

(MANISHA JAIN)
UIDNo. PB0158
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 24th August, 2026

**No. 691584-HII(2)-2026/8570**.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **8/2024 dated 07.08.2026** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

BRIJ BHUSHAN S/O SH. JAGDISH RAM, H. NO.3230/1, SECTOR 47-D, CHANDIGARH (WORKMAN)

AND

1. M/S CROWN ASSOCIATE, SCO NO.1, GATE NO.5, SECTOR 85, MOHALI.
2. SH. RAJVINDER WALIA, PROPRIETOR, M/S CROWN ASSOCIATE, H.NO.69, PHASE IX, MOHALI. (MANAGEMENT)

AWARD

1. Workman Brij Bhushan has presented Industrial Dispute in hand under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *(here-in-after in short called 'ID Act').*

2. Case of the workman is that he was appointed by the management as Delivery Boy 28 years back and he remained in uninterrupted employment up to 30.04.2023 when his services were illegally& wrongly terminated by the management. He was drawing ` 15,000/- per month as wages. The management remained at Chandigarh and was operating its business from SCO No.8, 1st Floor, Sector 20, Chandigarh but later on the month of January, 2023 it shifted to Mohali. The workman remained at Chandigarh and looking after his work from his residence. On 01.05.2023 the workman went to attend his normal duty but the management without any provocation started abusing him and started beating him and also refused work to him. Refusal of work which amounts to termination is retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the ID Act. The management has violated Section 25F of the ID Act as No charge sheet was issued, no inquiry was held and no retrenchment compensation was paid to the workman at the time of termination. For his reinstatement, the workman served upon the management a demand notice dated 02.06.2023. The management neither denied the contents of the demand notice nor took the workman back on duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh was requested for his intervention. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer intervened but the dispute could not be settled within stipulated time. Termination is illegal, wrongful, motivated, against the principles of natural justice and amounts to unfair labour practice. The workman remained unemployed from the date of termination. A prayer was made for reinstatement of the workman with continuity of service, full back wages and without any change in his service conditions.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection that the claim is not maintainable as there is no relationship of employer & employee between the management and workman. The workman was working on commission basis and the payment was made under Section 194C of the Income Tax Act, 1956 being sub-contractor with the management. He had taken a loan of around ` 3,00,000/- and odd amount from the management and in lieu of the same, security cheques have been issued. When the management asked for return of the loan amount, the present

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

false and frivolous claim has been raised by the workman. On merits, it is stated that M/s Crown Associate came into existence only in the year 2013-14, thus there is no question of appointing the workman as Delivery Boy 28 years back. It is admitted that the earlier the business of M/s Crown Associate was being operated
from Sector 20, Chandigarh and later on shifted to Mohali. The workman himself admitted that he used to work from his residence. Since there is no relationship of employer & employee between the parties so there is no question of retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the ID Act and violation of Section 25F of the ID Act. Remaining averments of the claim statement were denied and a prayer was made that the claim of the workman be dismissed.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated25.07.2024 :-

1. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is illegal ? If so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to ?OPW

2. Whether there is no relationship of employer and employee between management No.1 and workman ?OPM

3. Whether the claim statement is not maintainable in the present form ? OPM

4. Relief.

5. Thereafter, both the parties were called upon to lead their respective evidence.

6. In evidence of the workman, workman himself appeared as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' and he was partly cross-examined.Thereafter, the case remained pending for cross-examination. The workman did not dare to step in the witness box for further cross-examination.

7. I have gone through the case file. In the case in hand, as per claim of the workman, he was aggrieved that his services were terminated illegally by the management in violation of the provisions of the Section 2(oo) and Section 25-F of the ID Act. However, today none has appeared on behalf of the workman. It seems that the workman is not interested in perusing the matter. Accordingly, the industrial dispute in hand stands declined for want of prosecution. Appropriate Government be informed accordingly. File be consigned to records after due compliance.

(Sd/-) . . .,

Dated : August 07, 2026.

(MANISHA JAIN)
UIDNo. PB0158
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 24th August, 2026

**No. 674426-HII(2)-2026/8572.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment"s Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **32/2024 dated 03.08.2026** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between:

POOJA DEVI S/O SH. ARVIND PASWAN, AGED 24 YEARS, R/O VILLAGE KANSA DEVI, TEHSIL KHARAR, DISTRICT SAS NAGAR MOHALI (PUNJAB) (WORKMAN)

AND

1. THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR, FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2ND FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH.
2. THE FORESTER (KANSAL & KAMBAWALA BEAT), FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2ND FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH.
3. THE FOREST GUARD (KANSAL & KAMBAWALA BEAT), FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2ND FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH.
4. SH. JUGAL KISHOR & SONS, OFFICE AT VILLAGE MADHEVPUR, POST OFFICE SAKETARI, DISTRICT PANCHKULA, HARYANA.
5. BAGGA CONTRACTOR, C/O FOREST DEPARTMENT, CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION, PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, 2ND FLOOR, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 19-B, CHANDIGARH. (MANAGEMENT)

**AWARD**

1. Workman Pooja Devi has presented Industrial Dispute in hand under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, *1947 (here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'').*

2. Case of the workman is that the workman was appointed by management No.2 & 3 on behalf of Forest Department w.e.f. 14.08.2018 as Mali. Her last drawn wages were ` 11,900/- per month. She had continuously worked with the management up to 09.05.2023. The services of the workman were shown under management No.4 & 5 after the year 2018 but management No.1 to 3 have full supervision & control on her service. On 10.05.2023, the services of the workman were terminated without giving any prior notice. The management had not issued any memo, charge sheet nor conducted any inquiry in any matter before termination of her services. The management had neither paid or offered notice pay in lieu of notice nor paid retrenchment compensation to the workman. Job of the workman still exists with the management. Juniors to the workman were retained in service and fresh workers were appointed in place of the workman. The management has violated the provisions of Section 25F, 25G & 25H of the ID Act. Prayer was made for reinstatement of the workman with continuity of service with full back wages and all other applicable consequential benefits.

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

3. Management No.1 to 3 contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection that there was no privity of contract between the workman and the answering management, as such, no employer-employee relationship ever existed between them. On merits, it is specifically denied that the workman was appointed by the answering management w.e.f. 14.08.2018 as Mali. Since the workman was never employed by the answering management so the question of termination of her services does not arise. A prayer was made for dismissal of the claim of the workman.

4. Management No.4 & 5 did not file separate written statement. Learned Representative for management No.1 to 5 made the statement that he did not intend to file separate written statement on behalf of management No. 4 & 5 and written statement filed by management No.1 to 3 jointly be considered on behalf of management No.4 & 5.

5. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 21.10.2024 :-

1. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is illegal, if so, to what effect and to what relief she is entitled to, if any ? OPW

2. Whether the claimant-workman does not fall within the definition of 'workma' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act ?OPM

3. Whether the claim statement is not maintainable in the present form ? OPM

4. Relief.

6. Thereafter, both the parties were called upon to lead their respective evidence.

7. During the pendency of the present industrial dispute, Learned Representative for the workman made the statement, which reads as under :-

*"Stated that due to technical defect, I do not press the present Industrial Dispute Reference, with liberty to file the same afresh. The present Industrial Disputes Reference may be decided accordingly."*

8. In view of the aforesaid statement of Learned Representative for the workman, the industrial dispute in hand stands disposed off being not pressed with liberty to file the same afresh. Appropriate Government be informed accordingly. File be consigned to records after due compliance.

(Sd/-) . . .,

Dated : August 03, 2026.

(MANISHA JAIN)
UIDNo. PB0158
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory Chandigarh.

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**Notification**

The 20th August, 2026

**No: 164 E.I./V.D.I (3E).—**Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice has been pleased to make the following promotions on the establishment of this Hon'ble Court in the cadre of Private Secretary in Level 16 in the Pay Matrix (initial Pay ` 48,700/-) of Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2021, on the establishment of this Hon'ble Court, w.e.f. 19.08.2026 :–

| Sr. No | Name | E.Code | From | To | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Ms. Neelam Kumari | 6235 | Offg. Judgment Writer | Offg. Private Secretary | Against vacant post |
| 2 | Ms. Nisha-I | 6225 | -do- | -do- | -do- |

**Note:** The above promotions of the officers are on probation in terms of Rule 23(1) of Establishment (Appointment & Conditions of Service) Rules, 1973.

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(Sd/-) . . .,

(ASHISH KUMAR BANSAL)
Registrar (Administration)
*for* Registrar General

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
HOME DEPARTMENT
(DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION AND REVENUE BRANCH)

**Notification**

The 21st August, 2026

**No. e-676935-HIII(5)/2026/6667.**—A Committee consisting of the following members including the Chairperson is hereby constituted to determine the category of institutions–Nursing Homes/Educational Institutions/Social Institutions/Hotels/Clubs/Petrol Pumps for the purpose of application of collector rates in Union Territory, Chandigarh :-

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration | Chairperson |
| 2. | Deputy Commissioner, Union Territory, Chandigarh | Member |
| 3. | Director Higher Education, Union Territory, Chandigarh | Member |
| 4. | Director School Education, Union Territory, Chandigarh | Member |
| 5. | Director Health Services, Union Territory, Chandigarh | Member |
| 6. | Director Social Welfare, Union Territory, Chandigarh | Member |
| 7. | Director Food and Supplies, Union Territory, Chandigarh | Member |
| 8. | Tehsildar (Revenue), Union Territory, Chandigarh | Member Secretary |

The Committee shall also review the Collector Rates recommended by the Committee under the Chairmanship of Deputy Commissioner, UT Chandigarh constituted vide Chandigarh Administration Notification dated 22.11.2024, as under:-

| Sr. No | Type of Institution | Multiplying factor |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Religious Institutions | **0.25** of collector rate of corresponding residential area of the site. |
| 2. | Nursing Homes/Hospitals | **1.25** of collector rate of corresponding residential area of the site. |
| 3. | Social Institutions-Charitable | **0.25** of collector rate of corresponding residential area of the site. |
| 4. | Social Institutions-other than charitable | **1.0** of collector rate of corresponding residential area of the site. |

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5. | Education Institutions- Govt Aided Private schools, Govt. Aided Private colleges | **1.25** of collector rate of corresponding residential area of the site. |
| 6. | Education Institutions- Private schools, Private colleges | **1.5** of collector rate of corresponding residential area of the site. |
| 7. | Hotels, Clubs, Petrol Pumps | **1.0** of collector rate of corresponding commercial area of the site. |

Chandigarh, dated
the 11.08.2026

Chief Secretary,
Union Territory, Chandigarh

*"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/ public notices will remain solely, responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc. "*

*094—Ptg. & Sty. Deptt., U.T., Chd.*

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*
*https://egazette.chd.gov.in*